

THE Converted Catholic.

EDITED BY FATHER O'CONNOR.

When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.—Luke xxii., 32.

Vol. II.

OCTOBER, 1885.

No. 11.

CONTENTS

Editorial Notes.....	321	ond, Different Kinds of Law.	
An Evangelistic Tour Through Iowa.		Chapter I., On the Natural	
By the Editor. Part I.....	323	and Divine Law. Chapter II.,	
Rev. George C. Needham.....	324	On Ecclesiastical and Civil	
Rev. Stephen Dekins' Work.....	325	Law. Chapter III., Penal and	
Converts from Rome. Letters		Annuling Laws. Chapter	
from many Converts....	326	IV., Unwritten Law or Cus-	
Father Hyacinthe on National Re-		tom. Chapter V., Favorable	
ligion.....	328	Law or Privilege. Cases of	
A Question and its Answer.....	329	Conscience on Laws.....	334
The Decline of Romanism.....	330	Father O'Connor's Letters to	
The Massacre of St. Bartholomew.	332	Cardinal McCloskey (second	
The Moral Theology of the Jesuits.		series). Letter X.....	339
Treatise on Laws: Part Sec-		Rome: Pagan and Papal (con-	
		tinued). Chapter xvii.....	345

EDITORIAL NOTES.

WE HOPE OUR READERS WILL BEAR patiently with us in the delay of this issue owing to our absence in Iowa.

THE END OF THE SUBSCRIPTION year is fast approaching, and we appeal to our subscribers to renew without further delay. As we said last month, this is a small matter to each one of them, but it is of the greatest importance to us. Our "Free List" for sending copies regularly and by

request to Roman Catholics, priests and people, is one of the most deserving features of our work and is second to none in importance. By it we reach hundreds every month who would not be otherwise informed of the false and dangerous teachings of the Roman Church. It would be a great pity if such a missionary work should cease or be curtailed in its usefulness for lack of means. Those of our subscribers who can devote some amount for this purpose can forward it with their own subscription.

THE FOLLOWING KIND NOTICE IN *The New York Christian Advocate*, October 1st, greeted us on our return from the West and is highly appreciated:

"The services at Wesley Church, Des Moines, Iowa, on Sunday, September 12th, were of special interest. It was the last Sabbath of the year previous to Conference, and the closing one of a two years' pastorate of the Rev. Mr. Blodgett. In the morning the pastor received into full membership some thirty members. During the past two years nearly three hundred have been received into the church. Two years ago this society was worshipping in old Wesley Chapel, with a congregation that would hardly fill the lecture-room of the new edifice. To-day it is one of the strongest societies in the West. In the evening Father O'Connor, the leader of the Reformed Catholic movement, addressed a crowded congregation. Father O'Connor is now pastor of a strong society in New York City. The Ministerial Association of Des Moines, at their second session for the year, unanimously passed the following: '*Resolved*, That the thanks of this Association be hereby tendered to Father O'Connor for his instructive address; that we do sincerely indorse his work, and pray the blessing of the Triune God upon its continuance and unfolding.'"

IN CONNECTION WITH THE "SCHOOL war" in West Troy, which is treated at length in this month's "Letter to Cardinal McCloskey," we received the following note from an esteemed correspondent:

"We are especially interested in your work just now for this reason. Our pastor's wife's former home was in West Troy. Last week there was a meeting there to determine whether a large school, presided over by a priest, should be a union school or not, and receive the public money. The Cath-

olics carried the meeting by force, sending for Romanists outside of the district to fill the room, and shutting out nearly one hundred voters. There was a terrible riot. Two men were stabbed. They determined to make away with the brother of our pastor's wife. The priest ordered them to carry the vote, if they were obliged to do so over dead bodies. I hope you may be able to get all the facts and publish them in the hope of arousing Americans.

"Yours truly, F. M."

THE REV. F. R. SCULLY, A FORMER Roman Catholic priest, was ordained pastor of the First Baptist Church, Braddock, Pa., October 30th. The Rev. Richard Louis Knox, who was also a Roman Catholic Priest, was received into the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church by Bishop Robertson at St. Louis, Missouri, September 27th. A full account of these interesting events in our next issue.

WHAT A PLEASURE TO RESUME OUR services in Masonic Temple after our absence in the West! But it will be hard work to obtain the means of paying the expenses of the meetings. When we have a house of worship free of rent, all our energies can be devoted to the spiritual part of the work, and this is true of Brother Dekins' work also. Come over and help us, Christian friends.

THE REV. G. C. NEEDHAM WILL BE with us for a week's evangelistic work in connection with the Reformed Catholic services early in November. The sketch of Brother Needham and his work in this issue gives only a faint idea of this great evangelist. Our readers will be pleased to learn that we have received the first of a series of articles from Mrs. Needham which will appear in an early issue.

AN EVANGELISTIC TOUR THROUGH IOWA.

[BY THE EDITOR.]

I.

In the latter part of August I received an invitation from the Rev. H. H. Fairall, D.D., Iowa City, Iowa, to visit that State during the month of September. I had met Dr. Fairall two years previously at the Clear Lake Assembly, Iowa, where I had been engaged to lecture, after speaking at Lake Bluff Assembly near Chicago. He had been connected with the recently defunct American and Foreign Christian Union for thirteen years as Superintendent of Missions, and was deeply interested in the evangelization of the Roman Catholics in all lands. His "History of Italy from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Present Time" had given him a reputation among the best scholars of the age. An invitation from such a man, who had besides materially helped me in my work during the past year, could not be neglected. And yet I had many misgivings as to the success of such a visit. I have so much work pressing on me constantly in New York City, daily growing in responsibility, without means of employing assistance, that I hesitated in going away for such a length of time. Dr. Fairall's letters were so urgent, however, that I finally consented to go. As a Roman Catholic priest, I had known how converted Catholics were regarded in every community they visited. The Roman Catholics hated them with all the intensity of their natures, and the Protestants shrank from contact or the expression of sympathy with them. Since I left

the Roman Church I have neither spoken in a church or hall outside New York without an official invitation from pastors, or societies, or Christian men of established reputations, nor have I personally solicited such invitation. But I have been ready and willing to go anywhere to lecture for the same compensation that other public men who are not "great" receive for their services, or to preach without compensation when efforts are made to bring the Roman Catholics to hear me. Dr. Fairall understood my position perfectly, and in his arrangements with churches in which I was to speak he urged the pastors to invite their Catholic fellow-citizens to attend my services.

Leaving New York September 4th, I passed Sunday the 6th in Chicago where I had been ordained a Roman Catholic priest in 1871, and where I could count my friends by the hundred until eight years ago. Now I was "a stranger in a strange city." Time did not permit me to call on any of my former associates in the priesthood or on my relatives in that city. I had a brief and pleasant interview, however, with a converted Catholic ecclesiastic, Mr. John Styles, who had been a member of the order of St. Viateur at Bourbonnais, Kankakee, Illinois, for three years, and is now a theological student at Morgan Park Seminary, near Chicago. Brother Styles, in preparing for the ministry, designs to become an evangelist to his Roman Catholic brethren. His uncle is a priest in Wisconsin, and this brave young convert in his new-born zeal returned to his uncle's parish and preached Christ as the only way of salvation, in a school-house, the

only place open to him. His uncle denounced him to the people and they savagely assaulted him. He is a fine young man, only twenty years of age, and gives great promise for the future. I pressed on to Burlington, Iowa, where I addressed a good congregation in the Methodist Church, September 8th. The Rev. Mr. Swan, pastor of the United Presbyterian Church, the venerable Dr. Salter, who has been pastor of the Congregational Church for forty years, and the other pastors, made my visit to Burlington one to be pleasantly remembered. One of the Roman Catholic priests and Colonel Scott, a leading Roman Catholic in the State, were noticed as the most attentive of my hearers. The Rev. Dr. Salter invited me to address his congregation some Sunday before I would leave the State, and I was assured that hundreds of Roman Catholics would attend, as my discourse was a presentation of the scriptural way of salvation, so much better than the Roman way, to which plentiful reference was made. I regret that I was unable to return to Burlington, which is a stronghold of Romanism, many of the most influential people there being of that faith. The power and influence of the Roman Catholic Church in Burlington, as in all the river towns in Iowa, is very great. The first settlers were glad to get Irish and German Roman Catholic laborers to help in the rough pioneer work, and now those followers of Rome threaten to outnumber the Americans. Here surely is a field for evangelistic work. But Dr. Fairall met me there and said the appointments in other parts of the State were already made.

J. A. O'C.

Rev. George C. Needham.

Rev. George C. Needham, the evangelist, who has been conducting religious services in Lynn for the past week, is a native of Ireland. He was born near the lakes of Killarney. His parents were Protestants and the graphic recital of a sermon by an older sister when he was five years of age gave him his first religious bent.

His coming to America was partly accidental. A sister in low health was in much need of a sea voyage, and he brought her over here to visit other sisters. That was in 1868, and his intention was to remain three months. He began preaching, however, and it was several years before he returned. In 1869 he joined Mr. Moody in his evangelical labors in Chicago, and was associated with him for several months. They have remained warm friends ever since. He has preached in the prominent cities of eighteen States, and is personally acquainted with the leading ministers throughout the United States and Great Britain. He has met with the greatest success in Portland, Indianapolis, Providence, Richmond, Halifax and other cities in this country and Canada. He was one of the first to introduce Bible readings into this country, and has given more attention to the exposition of the Scriptures than to any other department of his work. He has endeavored in every way to induce young men to study the Bible, and has taken a prominent part in organizing Young Men's Christian Associations.

Mr. Needham has been a voluminous writer ever since he entered the ministry. He has written several large books, and about a dozen small tracts. In company with his wife, who is a gifted writer, he is now preparing a work on Bible readings and expositions. He has also published a life of Spurgeon, whose sale has reached 10,000 copies.

The evangelist has been the hardest sort of a worker all his life. He preaches nightly almost the whole year

round. He gives Bible readings nearly every afternoon, sometimes conducts a morning prayer meeting, preaches frequently four or five times a Sunday, carries on a voluminous correspondence and contributes to a large number of magazines and papers.

He spends the "vacation" summer months in his cottage at Manchester-by-the-sea, preaching in the neighborhood three to four times a week, besides holding drawing-room meetings in towns near by. His house is a rendezvous for tired evangelists, broken-down preachers and returned missionaries.

Mr. Needham is under the medium height, with a form a little inclined to stoutness. His hair and full short beard are just sprinkled with gray. His features are expressive, and lit up with a pair of pleasant black eyes. He talks with all the lively fluency of the Irish race. His preaching abounds in illustrations, but he never attempts oratory, and seldom rises above the lecture style. His discourses are of a lively, entertaining nature, and very effective. He seems to make a personal appeal to each one of his hearers, no matter how large is the audience. Like Moody, what he says is never obscure; the meaning is revealed instantly by the felicitous wording.

Mr. Needham is married and has two children, both sons, and both of whom he hopes will be ministers and missionaries.

Mrs. Needham usually accompanies him in his travels. She is widely known as an author and poet, having written several books, and is a frequent contributor of poetry to the religious papers. Mr. Needham does not hesitate to say that she is a better expositor of the Scriptures than he is, and that her Bible readings are more instructive. Her voice has been heard in Lynn, and many hope she will aid in the religious movement. Mr. Needham and Mr. Moody have been co-workers for many years, and have labored together in Europe as well as in this country.

Evangelist Needham conducted two revival services yesterday afternoon and last evening, which for impressiveness have not been equalled in Lynn. At the Free Will Baptist Church on High street the auditorium was filled with a devout congregation which occupied all the seating space. Women largely predominated, and the preacher gave a plain, earnest and practical talk on the essentials of a Christian life. Professor Towner's choir and singing are a great augmentative force. Last night Mr. Needham with Secretary Gray, of the Young Men's Christian Association, and Professor Towner went out to Glenmere Church and the evangelist preached to a congregation which extended to the doors. There was an earnest period of prayer. Mr. Moody addresses the meeting at the Coliseum to-night.—*Lynn (Mass.) Daily Bee, September 26th, 1885.*

—o—

Rev. Stephen Dekins' Work.

A large congregation greeted the pastor of the Reformed Catholic Church in Library Hall, Sunday evening, September 27th. Pastor Dekins preached on "The Mission of the Church," and in the course of his remarks said, "Many in these days present the work and mission of Christ all garnished and decorated with flowers till it is entirely hidden by the garnishing, and that is the reason they are unable to reach the masses, and that the pews are empty. If we Reformed Catholics had the means I am confident under God there would be one of the greatest revivals of religion ever known in Newark among a class who know not Christ. We are crippled for the want of a house in which to hold our meetings. However, let us do what we can in building up the Master's Kingdom, for remember in the better country we shall receive the unfading palm."—*Newark Daily Advertiser.*

CONVERTS FROM ROME.

PUNKSUTAWNEY, PA.,
April 20th, 1885.

FATHER O'CONNOR :

DEAR SIR:—I was a Catholic once like yourself. I was born and brought up in that faith, until I was old enough to know better. I used to ride six miles every Sunday to church. My father and mother were strong members of that church, and so were my brothers and sisters. When I was sixteen years old I went to work on a railroad, and worked till spring, and then went to a Catholic school. I was there several months and as my father said the Catholic was the right way, I thought it was the only way of salvation for me. I then had my first communion in 1877, but I was dissatisfied; I did not feel any better for it nor any wiser, and had to go to confession again and again. My brother said to me one day, "Why don't you believe in confession and communion?" I said nothing, for I was afraid they would drive me from home. In 1878 I received confirmation, but I did not feel any better for all that had been done for me by the priests hitherto. The priest told me that if I did not keep the commandments of the Church and go to mass, confession, etc., I would go down to everlasting fire, and I then thought I was surely lost. The more I thought on the matter, the harder it was for me to believe in his Church; but I could not rest night or day until I made up my mind to disbelieve in the Roman Church altogether and accept the religion of Christ as it is in the Bible and as it is practised by the Protestant Christians around me.

DENNIS J. GRAHAM.

LAIRDSVILLE, N. Y.

DEAR SIR:

I have been receiving THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC for the past year, and like it very much. I lend the numbers to neighbors for their perusal. I have sent two or three of the Tracts to Catholic families, and will send the others where they will do the most good. Many of them are so bigoted that it is difficult to get them to read anything they are suspicious of, but your writings are sure to win them over.

Yours sincerely,
MISS J. M. N.

BOSTON, MASS.,
August 20th, 1885.

DEAR BROTHER O'CONNOR:

I have seen by the papers that you have been at Mr. Moody's Convention, and I earnestly wished that you could pay Boston a visit and preach here some Sunday. The announcement of your service would fill any of our churches, and I am sure many Roman Catholics would gladly hear you. I know the converted Catholics would rejoice to greet you. There are hundreds of them here. I meet them at the Y. M. C. A. rooms, at Dr. Cullis' meetings, and at prayer meetings in different churches. I am one myself, having been converted one year ago. Up to that time I was a faithful Roman Catholic. My business brought me into contact with some Christians who took an interest in my spiritual welfare and who talked to me so differently from the way of the priests, with whom I also did business, that I was favorably inclined to their views. It was not, however, until I called upon the Lord for myself and asked to know the way that I found Jesus to

be the way, the truth, and the life. Then I did not need a priest to lead me to him. My sister is in a convent, but I hope to get her out.

Yours in Christ's love, J. M. C.

A correspondent of the Evangelical *Christendom* writes from the city of Rome: On the 10th of June the well-known and distinguished lawyer, Sig. Giuseppe Petroni, openly professed his faith in Jesus Christ as his Saviour, in the Protestant church in Rome belonging to the Wesleyans. Brought up in the Romish faith, he for some time, nominally at least, was reckoned a devoted adherent of the Papacy. His large and varied practice at the Italian bar brought him, however, much in contact with the ways and precepts of the priesthood. Both precept and practice among that body opened his eyes, and he became for some length of time rationalistic in his views, throwing aside all religion. Whilst throwing his whole energy and sympathies into the Italian cause of freedom, he was seized by the party then in power (that is, the Papal), and escaped sentence of death by one vote only. Penal servitude for life, nevertheless, was the alternative, and for seventeen long years he underwent all the horrors of Papal prison discipline, being set at liberty only through the triumph of the National party in 1870. He is now seventy-two.

For a long time he attended the Protestant services at intervals. During the last year, however, he has frequented our worship assiduously, and on the 10th of June was baptized upon making a public profession of his faith in Christ as his Lord and Saviour. Admitted to the Lord's table, he wept for joy. Signor Petroni throws himself heartily, as far as circumstances permit, into everything which is calculated to advance the kingdom of God, and we can but hope and trust that his noble example will be the means of encouraging others to follow in his steps.

MERIDA, YUCATAN,

July 4th, 1885.

With the utmost pleasure I have just seen in a Mexican Protestant newspaper that you have proposed the noble and very important idea of "*providing evangelical literature in the Spanish language*," and as it has been my own idea for a long time, I haste to communicate to you my gratitude, and offer my services to carry it on, for I know from my own experience it will be beneficial to our race (the Latin), which, if it appears inferior to the Saxon and Teutonic, it is only for the Romish education, to which they have been subjected ever since the establishment of Popery. As was said in a recent issue of *Harper's Weekly*, on the fourth centenary of Luther, "The Saxon and Teutonic races rose up to a high grade of prosperity at the time of the Reformation; the Latin races because they rejected its teachings have, for three centuries, slumbered in dull reaction and decay." I am a native of this city, brought up a Roman Catholic until nineteen years old, when I had to go to your great country to Flushing Institute, L. I., to learn English. This is a Protestant school, and as the president, Rev. Mr. Fairchild, was a most respectable gentleman, and his family a very well educated one, I began to open my eyes and to think, and not long after I concluded that "the Protestant Church is called to raise up the Latin races, which are down only for want of a good education." Many good Protestants think that Mexico is Christian. Unhappily it is not true. The Government is pagan, and the Church, which calls itself "Roman Catholic," is nothing but pagan. Come and see it. How much do we Christians suffer from both! No place of worship on Sunday! No place to educate our children! It is wonderful there is not a single evangelical church or school here in Merida, with 50,000 inhabitants, and so much in contact with the United States. R. AZNA.

—*Christian at Work.*

Father Hyacinthe on National Religion.

The announcement that Father Hyacinthe would deliver an address on the secularization of the Panthéon drew an enormous gathering July 2d to the winter circus in Paris. The proceedings were remarkable not only from the wonderful oratorical powers of the speaker, but also from the unruly demeanor of some intolerant fanatics. M. Loyson was heard with respectful attention as long as he confined himself to describing the Panthéon as a patriotic temple, but he excited a storm when he protested against the antagonism which it was sought to create between the spirit of revolution and the spirit of religion, and it grew into a tempest when he denounced as unwise, unpatriotic, and unphilosophical the proposal to tear down the Cross from the building which sheltered the remains of Saint Geneviève, the patron saint of Paris, and of Victor Hugo. He protested against the notion that the great national uprising of 1789 was irreligious. He continued:

"The famous oath taken at the Versailles Tennis Court ninety-six years ago was not founded upon blasphemy. The revolution was essentially religious in its character, and that religious character was especially conspicuous in the Declaration of the Rights of Man. I will not appeal to Robespierre, though I hold him to have been sincere, for the reason that the means he resorted to were detestable. I will have none of that priestcraft of the guillotine, but would, on the contrary, adopt the prayer of Gen. Hoche, who prayed to God to nerve the arm of French soldiers in battle to extirpate all factions from the republic."

Here there was considerable uproar,

which increased tenfold when, continuing his address, he asked, "Must the Cross be retained on the summit of the Panthéon?" For full ten minutes there was a scene of wild confusion, cries of "*oui*" and "*non*," and all that unseemly scuffling that generally marks the public meetings of the champions of liberty, equality, and fraternity. After the audience had shouted themselves hoarse he was able to continue:

"Even if the Cross had ceased to have a religious signification, if even it were but the emblem of a thing that was utterly past and gone, it would be needful to proceed to long and exhaustive deliberation before doing away with it. The early Christians showed greater toleration than modern Republicans. In the foundations of Notre Dame an altar of the days of Tiberius had been discovered. The altar of Christ had not destroyed the altar of Paganism, but had been raised above it, and the maxim of the early Christians was '*Diis ne insultes*.' Do not therefore suppress the past; only barbarians such as Attila—"

Here there arose a tremendous tumult. Amid the din Father Hyacinthe was heard to say, "You cannot place another emblem above the Cross." A voice from the audience cried, "Why not a weather-cock?" Father Hyacinthe replied, "You see you have no other emblem," whereupon another person exclaimed, "And the national flag." M. Loyson continued:

"Yes, I love and reverence the national flag, but it is only the emblem of our country, whereas the Cross is the sacred symbol of the common Fatherland of all mankind. Do what you will, however, you cannot prevent the Panthéon being beatified with the Cross. You may tear it down from the roof, but it is embodied in its very structure, which is in the form of a Greek Cross."

After fresh uproar, mingled with applause, he proceeded, amid constant interruption:

"Revolutionary fanaticism is but Ultramontaniam reversed. Even before the clergy had raised its voice to protest they shouted to the priests, 'Away with the Cross or we shall tear it down!' (Shouts of 'Yes, Yes! down with the Cross!') I know that too often the Cross has sheltered intolerance and superstition. It has been lighted up by the lurid glare of *autos da fé* (cry of 'And the Saint Bartholomew'). Yes, I know all that, but precisely because the Cross has been profaned, let us uphold it in our more faithful hands, and not surrender it to those who profaned it (applause). Do not forget the tears it has dried, the devotion it has inspired (ironical laughter). If you do not believe me, hear your great poet, Victor Hugo. To touch the Cross would be the act of criminals and madmen (fresh uproar). But it will survive and defy all attempts to overthrow it (shouts: 'We shall see'). The Cross is the gibbet of the slave sanctified by the sacrifice of a God, and the modern world is the outcome of that sacrifice. The Revolution is the daughter of the Cross; it is but one act in the great drama which commenced on Calvary. I repeat, it would be crime and madness to touch the emblem of liberty, equality, and brotherly love. In America we are accused of being materialists, of begetting a new race of degenerate men. That Cross which you would pull down is not merely so much wood, or stone, or metal. *Ce n'est rien et c'est tout.* If you pull it down you tell the world, we are Frenchmen, the representatives of materialism, of blasphemy; we disclaim any further connection with Christian civilization. But your efforts will be fruitless. In spite of them the Cross will continue to tower aloft above mythological and philosophic gods, and extend its fostering arms as two eagles wings over the brotherhood of mankind. It will remain forever the eternal symbol of the fraternity of man on earth, and the paternity of God our Father which is in Heaven."

Applause mingled with hooting greeted the close of this remarkable address. M. Loyson, who had got down from the platform, once more rushed into the tribune, and exclaimed, "*La Croix, je vous le dis, c'est la liberté.*" The audience separated in a state of considerable excitement.—*London Standard*, July 3.

A Question and its Answer.

The *Christian Index* (Baptist) of Atlanta, Ga., says:

We have noticed of late some indications that Romanists feel a special antipathy toward Presbyterians—a fact of which we were not before aware. For example, the *Catholic Examiner*, Brooklyn, not long since, said:

For several weeks after his assumption of office, President Cleveland did not attend church at all—which was bad—and when at last he did go, it was to one of the Presbyterian persuasion—which was worse.

More recently, and in a similar strain, the *Catholic Standard*, Philadelphia, said:

Of all Protestant sects, that of the Presbyterians is most blind and bigoted in its satanic hatred of the Catholic Church.

Can any one tell us why there should be this peculiar bitterness towards the sons of Calvin on the part of papists?

To this question, the *Interior* (Presbyterian) of Chicago, makes answer:

For the same reason that the bear was wroth with the youthful David, who smote him and delivered the lamb out of his mouth.

And this reminds us of a recent corroborative *jeu d'esprit* from the elegant pen of our pious neighbor,

"Father" Phelan, of the *Western Watchman*, who is as modest as he is pure. This distinguished priest wrote:

"The redoubtable Van Meter is here—the man of Bibles, who drove an ass and cart behind Garibaldi's Red Shirts when the latter entered Rome through the *Porte Pia*. During the Vatican Council he opened a printing-office under the windows of the Pope, and kept up his shoutings and hootings by day and night—he and his daughter and the ass. In consideration of these services, he feels himself entitled to pass around the hat among the Protestants of St. Louis. A bob-tailed rat who burrowed his hole and made his nest by the Vatican wall, has as much right to compensation. Van Meter is a Presbyterian. When Italy is converted from Catholicism to dyspepsia, we shall contribute our share to the support of the ass."

Isn't that "a gem of purest ray"? Its startling brilliancy is due to the fact that the sweet-tempered "Father" supposed Mr. Van Meter to be a Presbyterian. Had he known that the gentleman whose advent he heralds in such marvellously eloquent terms is only a Baptist, his genius for vituperation could not have been inspired to so high a pitch. Only a Presbyterian can spur a Romish priest to the happiest expression of ardent Christian love.—*St. Louis Presbyterian*.

—o—

The Decline of Romanism.

The following article from the *London Christian*, July 23d, should be carefully read by our public men and writers for the press who are dazzled by the modern "respectability" of the Roman Catholic body in our large cities:

It is but rarely that a skilled advocate of the claims of the Church of Rome can be brought to admit either a weakness or a failure, and it is, therefore, all the more surprising that one of her ablest defenders should volunteer acknowledgments of both. So much has of late years been asserted with regard to the rapid spread and increase of Romanism in Great Britain, one is scarcely prepared to find that, after all, alarm is, to a great extent, groundless; yet this admission, and a score of others not less remarkable and damaging, are made in a singular paper upon "The Conversion of England," from the pen of a distinguished writer, which appears in a recent number of a leading Roman Catholic review. The author, in considering the means by which the country might be brought back to "the fold of unity," gives much prominence to lay activity, organization, work amongst the poor, and "the spirit of Christian poverty, a protest by plain living against the frivolity of the world."

There are but few who would object to see even the Church of Rome working more earnestly upon these lines. The writer, however, goes on to assert that in all these matters his Church is defective, lay activity being anything but pronounced, lay organization not worthy the name, that "our work among the poor is trifling compared with what is within our power," that the spirit of poverty is scarcely ever mentioned out of the pulpit, and that, instead of making gigantic strides, it is more than questionable if Romanism is not sliding back, there being no room for either exultation or self-congratulation on the fulfilment of the anticipations indulged in and entertained in the excitement of the Tractarian movement.

The essayist at the same time congratulates himself upon the fact that during the last forty years the estimation in which his Church is held among Protestants has risen in a marked degree; but he attributes this

in a very great measure to architecture rather than to spiritual power. The building of great churches, such as the Brompton Oratory, and others to which he refers, has given "a new respectability to the Catholic body" in the eyes of outsiders; nothing succeeds like success; and "to all outward appearance" great strides have been made.* This outward appearance, however, will not bear close examination; for, although the number of chapels and stations in England and Wales has increased from 457 to 1,259, and the priests from 542 to 2,159, the writer discounts this by admitting that the figures are "most misleading as proofs of progress," and by a statement that the number of small missions has greatly increased, and a chapel or a priest now represents a very much smaller average congregation than at an earlier date. Many priests, too, are unattached, and a considerable number are engaged in schools and colleges, and religious establishments.

In 1841 there were in Great Britain, Mr. Lucas states, 800,000 Roman Catholics. According to the general growth of the population during the last forty-two years, *i. e.*, 62 per cent. on the census of 1841, there should be an increase of nearly half a million in the numbers of the Roman Catholic body. Including the Irish in England, the entire number of Roman Catholics in Great Britain should "at the very least" stand at 2,360,000. Instead of this, the evidence afforded by school attendance, one of the best and safest tests, points to a total Roman Catholic population of only 1,362,760, or, as the writer tersely puts it, the figures show "a falling away of at least three-quarters of a million of souls." No wonder that Mr. Lucas adds, "the results of an inspection are lamentable in the extreme," and that he seems to be afraid to consider what the falling off would have amounted to if there had not been the Irish immigration.

Discussing the possible remedies for "this terrible state of affairs," the writer points out that active charity is

very rare in the Roman Catholic communion; that the work of such societies as that of St. Vincent of Paul is a mere trifle when compared with the needs of the poor; and that as the "crumbling" Church of England has "sucked into itself, or at any rate, out of their faith, a vast number of the Catholics," thousands of Catholics having "disappeared into it," the exertions which would be quite sufficient in a Catholic country to prevent "leakage" are quite insufficient in England. Roman Catholics, as a rule, Mr. Lucas says, are deficient in determination to help to save the poor from eternal perdition; their distaste for coming in contact with squalor outweighs their charity and love of Christ.

These are serious indictments, and it is noteworthy that Mr. Lucas has no more powerful remedy to propose than an increase in the subscriptions from the Roman Catholic poor, "who will subscribe if properly approached," but however disheartening the outlook may be from the Roman Catholic point of view, surely those simple-minded Protestants who have been wasting time in bemoaning the spread of Romanism in England, may take heart again, seeing that their fears have been baseless. The Kingdom which cometh not with observation, is after all, surely, if slowly, extending its boundaries day by day.

From the Boston *Christian Register* we have the following article on the want of progress in the Roman Catholic Church in America:

An American Catholic writer of much spirit and enthusiasm has recently put forth an interesting *brochure* in New York, calling upon the members of his communion for more earnest efforts for the Church, and especially exhorts them to imitate the Protestant charities in their devotion and organization in behalf of the children of the lowest poor. He quotes a striking passage from the writings of an English Jesuit intimating that "the

progress of Catholicism in the United States is more apparent than real," and admitting that "the entire number of children lost to the faith in less than half a century is three millions and a half."

This remarkable admission is confirmed by the author of this pamphlet, "A Plea for Children," who is evidently a devout and earnest member of the Roman Catholic Church. He admits that "the very enormity of the figures has tended to make us apathetic in regard to this fearful evil;" and he believes that "the time has come to make a mighty effort to remedy this evil, gigantic as it is."

There can be little doubt of the essential truth of this statement; that is, that great numbers of youth have been lost, in the past few years, to the Catholic Church in this country, and that its increase of numbers does not keep pace with the natural growth of the population among its members. Any of our readers familiar with large cities will recognize the fact among certain foreign races who have settled here, such as the Italians and the Southern Germans. It is very evident that the large majority of the youth of these do not grow up in the Catholic communion.

The same thing is true, though to a less degree, among the Irish Catholics born in this country. The increase, under any circumstances, of the American Catholic Church, is considerable; but it should be remembered that the races which furnish its members are naturally the most prolific of any upon our soil. The great fact is that the increase of this Church does not keep up with the natural increase of its members.

This is the more remarkable, because the Roman Church in the United States has enjoyed extraordinary public assistance. In all the prominent cities great sums have been appropriated from taxation to aid its funds and erect its buildings. Moreover, it has had a peculiar and advantageous connection with certain portions of our

political parties. Nothing has been so dreaded by our leading politicians as to be supposed to be in opposition to the Roman Church; and a certain connection with it, as was shown in the late Presidential canvass, has been of immense assistance to any aspirant for a high office. Yet, notwithstanding these temporal advantages and its grand historical traditions, the Roman Catholic Church has certainly lost ground in the United States.

—o—

The Massacre of St. Bartholomew.

—

The Hon. John Jay, President of the Huguenot Society of America, delivered an address at the annual meeting of the society at New Rochelle, N. Y., August 24th, the anniversary of the massacre of the Huguenots in France in 1572, in which he said.

"New and most important light has been recently thrown upon this subject by the disclosure of the official action and utterances of his Holiness Pope Gregory XIII., as shown by the original correspondence of the Cardinal Orsini at Rome and the Papal Nuncio Salviati near the King at Paris, and of the Cardinal de Lorraine. These letters dispel at once and forever the doubts that have been raised in regard to the Pope's approval and encouragement of the massacre, by which even some Protestant writers have been beguiled. Our thanks for the disclosure of these conclusive letters are due to that accomplished historical writer, Lord Acton, who, as you know, is an eminent layman of the Roman Catholic Church, and one who tells the simple truth without fear or favor.

"In 1874 Mr. Gladstone dissected with singular power the Vatican decrees in their bearing on civil allegiance, and showed that she had substituted for the proud boast of *Semper eadem* a policy of violence and change

in faith; that she had refurbished and paraded anew every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused; that no one could become her convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another, and that she had equally repudiated modern thought and ancient history.

"A reply from Lord Acton (November 8th, 1874), marked by the most striking historic illustrations, seemed to argue that Mr. Gladstone was wrong in attaching so much practical importance to the promulgation of the dogma (Infallibility); that things equally bad, if not worse, had often been done by popes and councils and had been treated with contempt by Catholics, laymen and divines, whose assent did not display itself in action. Among his illustrations on this point Lord Acton said: 'Now Pius V., the only Pope who had been proclaimed a saint for many centuries, having deprived Elizabeth, commissioned an assassin to take her life; and his next successor' (this was Gregory XIII.) 'on learning that the Protestants were being massacred in France, pronounced the action glorious and holy, but comparatively barren of results, and implored the King during two months by his Nuncio and his Legate, to carry the work on to the bitter end until every Huguenot had recanted or perished.'

"This plain statement of facts, where each word had been weighed and had its meaning, called forth marked dissent, and on the 26th of November, 1874, Lord Acton contributed to the London *Times* (sixth page) the proofs of its correctness, in extracts from original letters in French and Italian of the Pope's Nuncio, Salviati, and of the Cardinal Orsini. These show that the Pope, after being informed by Salviati on the 2d of September that the report, that the massacre of August 24th, 1572, had been provoked by the detection of a Protestant conspiracy was an utter falsehood, so far from expressing his horror at the massacre which had occurred,

or seeking to prevent its extension, caused the King to be advised by the Nuncio of the desire of his Holiness, 'for the great glory of God and the greatest welfare of France, to see all the heretics of the kingdom extirpated' (*tous les hérétiques extirpés du royaume*), and he advised that the edict of pacification should be revoked. That advice, announced on the 22d September, was followed by Salviati's writing, on the 11th October, that the Holy Father had experienced 'an infinite joy and great consolation in learning that his Majesty had commanded me to write that he hoped that in a little while France would have no more Huguenots' (*qu'il espérait qu'avant peu la France n'aurait plus de Huguenots*). On the 19th December Cardinal Orsini, who had been despatched a Legate from Rome, congratulated the King on the glory of the massacre, and 'pressed him to renew his promise that not a single Huguenot should be left on the soil of France.'

"Lord Acton quoted the Egerton MSS. 2077, and in the Paris Library the Italian MSS. 1272; and the *Procès Verbaux des Assemblées du Clerge, I., Appendix 28*, and referred with satisfaction to the fact that among the applauding Cardinals one voice was raised in protest, that of Montalto, who became Sixtus V."

The above address of the Hon. John Jay, will be of interest in connection with the two hundredth anniversary of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, which will be commemorated October 18th. The Reformed Catholic services in Masonic Temple on that date will have special reference to this anniversary.

The esteem in which THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC is held by the religious press, which quotes largely from it, is very gratifying. It has a distinctive work to do, and it appeals to all Christians for support.

THE MORAL THEOLOGY OF THE JESUITS.

Translated for THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC from the Latin Text of Father
J. P. Gury, of the Society of Jesus, Professor of Moral Theology
in the Roman College.

TREATISE ON LAWS.

PART II.

DIFFERENT KINDS OF LAW.

Natural and divine law; ecclesiastical and civil law; penal and annulling law; unwritten or customary, and favorable.

CHAPTER I.

ON THE NATURAL AND DIVINE LAW.

ARTICLE I. Natural Law.

The natural law is the divine will manifested by natural light, ordaining such things as are in keeping with correct views (*que recte rationi consentanea sunt*).

ARTICLE II. Divine Positive Law.

Of this there are two kinds, the old and the new.

CHAPTER II.

ON ECCLESIASTICAL AND CIVIL LAW.

ARTICLE I. Ecclesiastical Law.

Ecclesiastical law is that which is enacted by the Church for the spiritual welfare and eternal happiness of her children. The collection of ecclesiastical laws constitutes what is called Canon Law and fills three folio volumes.

What are the Roman Congregations? There are eight: (1) Congregation of the Council of Trent or of Cardinals. It consists exclusively of cardinals who are called the "Fathers Interpreters of the Council of Trent." One of them is styled the Prefect of the Congregation. (2) Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, which also consists exclusively of cardinals. It looks after the proper administration of every Catholic diocese in the world and settles quarrels and controversies between regulars of each sex.

[Regulars live in monasteries and convents bound forever by solemn vows of poverty, chastity and obedience.]

(3) Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith; this, too, consists of cardinals alone. (4) Congregation of Sacred Rites, which supervises the liturgy of the Roman Church and superintends the beatification and canonization of saints. (5) Congregation of the Index which is composed of cardinals and

other learned men whose duties are of vast importance to both civil and ecclesiastical society. This Congregation must take care that books, wherever published, contain nothing contrary to Roman teaching. Offending works are indexed and their perusal strictly forbidden. Such writings are occasionally prohibited by the Congregation of the Holy Office, or by the pope himself, in short and dogmatic form, particularly when they are tainted with heresy. (6) Congregation of the Holy Office or of the Sacred Universal Inquisition. This is also called "Supreme" and is composed of cardinals, prelates, and regular theologians. It deals with actual or suspected heresy, and with all doctrines contrary to religion. (7) The Congregation of Indulgences and Relics settles all doubts and difficulties about relics and indulgences. (8) Congregation of Immunity deals with the rights and privileges of ecclesiastics. The two last are composed of cardinals and other prelates selected by the pope.

[Many other tribunals have been established in Rome for every conceivable object.]

ARTICLE II. Civil Law.

By civil law is meant the entire collection of laws and decrees passed by a temporal ruler for the well-being of his subjects.

CHAPTER III.

PENAL AND ANNULING LAWS.

ARTICLE I. On Penal Law.

A penal law binds us to the performance or omission of an act by some temporal penalty. This penalty must be regarded as just.

There cannot be a purely penal law, that is to say, a law in no respect binding in conscience; because every ordinance of a ruler has some binding power. This is the unanimous opinion of theologians.

There can be a merely penal law, that is to say, a law binding in conscience to the penalty which is attached to its violation.

ARTICLE II. On Annuling Law.

An annulling law declares a certain act void from the beginning, or to be regarded as such after a judicial decision. So there are laws annulling *ipso facto*, or only after the decision of a judge; laws that annul absolutely or conditionally, and immediately or mediately.

CHAPTER IV.

UNWRITTEN LAW OR CUSTOM.

Custom is a manner of acting that has grown out of repeated acts of the whole or a majority of the community. It can establish a new, abrogate an old, or modify an existing law. It is divided into (1) custom according to law or right; (2) beyond law or right; (3) contrary to law or right.

CHAPTER V.

FAVORABLE LAW OR PRIVILEGE.

Privilege is a lasting favor contrary to or beyond the common law, conferred by a legislator on certain persons or attached to certain dignities. (1) It is personal, local, or real; (2) opposed to the law or beyond it; (3) pleasing or hateful.

CASES OF CONSCIENCE ON LAWS.

CASE XVII. A dispensation refused in the first instance is afterwards granted by the same superior, who quite forgot the refusal.

Leopold wished to marry Sylvia but had made a vow of perpetual chastity; he applied to the Sacred Penitentiary for a dispensation under the assumed name of Titius and set forth the grave temptations against holy chastity to which he was subject. His application was refused but, nothing daunted, he said to himself: "Well, I'll try again and see what can be done." At the end of a month or so, he made a second application to the same congregation without mentioning the previous refusal, gave the very same reasons in the name of Sempronius and succeeded in getting a dispensation.

Q. 1. What is an obreptitious dispensation? What is a surreptitious one and when is it worthless?

Q. 2. Is Leopold's dispensation surreptitious and worthless?

A. 1. A dispensation is obreptitious when a person offers as principal motive a reason so false that if the truth were known no dispensation would be given.

It is surreptitious when a truth is suppressed which should have been expressed according to the rules and regulations of the Roman Curia. If deceit or fraud has been used, it is clear that such a dispensation is worthless; but if the false reason is merely a determining motive, without which the dispensation would have been granted, or if the suppressed truth has no direct and intrinsic bearing on the matter of the dispensation, or if a person is not bound by the rules of the Curia to declare it, the dispensation is valid, because it may be presumed that the superior would have given it, if the principal motive really exists.

A. 2. No, because this dispensation is not surreptitious although, perhaps, the superior would not have granted it if he remembered the previous refusal. The presumption that the superior would have refused is not well-founded. If he grants it for the same reasons that had already been offered, it is clear that they were sufficient for a dispensation. The previous refusal is of no account as it had no connection with the cause, and to refuse a dispensation on that score would not be in keeping with sound judgment. It is always better to relax a rigorous measure than to enforce it, when there is a fair reason for doing so. The previous refusal has nothing to do with the validity of the subsequent dispensation and Leopold was not bound to mention it to his superior. Accordingly, his dispensation is valid and not surreptitious. In the dispensa-

tions granted by the Sacred Penitentiary, no attention is ever paid to names as it is customary to use false ones, so that Leopold's change of name made no difference. It matters little whether it was Titius or Sempronius. Neither can it be said that he had the criminal intention of wishing to deceive his superior, because to exercise one's right is not to deceive.

CASE XIX. Annulling Law.

Thirsus on becoming heir to some property finds that the will made in his favor has not a particular formality which is imperatively required by the law. He says nothing about it but quietly enjoys his heritage.

Q. What advice should be given him?

A. According to the more probable opinion, Thirsus ought to be let alone if the law does not interfere with him, because, according to many theologians, an annulment of this nature is not to be found in the fact of the informality itself, but must be determined by a legal tribunal.

CASE XX. Penal Law.

Every time he thinks he can escape a fine, Sapricius secretes in his wagon, corn, wine, provisions and merchandise on which he should pay tolls. He avoids this payment by passing through the gates at night, by making detours, by avoiding the toll-gatherers, or deceiving them. He does not think it wrong to do this, because the tolls are heavy and numerous, are often imposed for objects that do not promote the public good, and are enforced by merely penal laws. Yet on going to Easter confession, he feels some scruple of conscience and wants to know whether he has done any harm.

Q. 1. Have merely penal laws been established?

Q. 2. Was Sapricius guilty of sin? Is he bound to make restitution?

A. 1. Such laws can be established and bind in a disjunctive manner: Either the law must be obeyed or the penalty of transgression paid, if the culprit be caught in the act. No law is binding beyond the intention of the legislator who can inflict the penalty alone, if it be sufficient for the protection of the public interest. For some laws that are not of much importance in this regard, a penalty is readily substituted.

Some merely penal laws seem to be established in certain localities. This is the opinion of many theologians. St. Liguori says: "Municipal laws forbidding the cutting of wood or grass, fishing, hunting, etc., are not binding under pain of sin." But what are the merely penal laws in each locality? This question can only be answered by the experienced and intelligent inhabitants of different localities.

A. 2. Theologians are divided in opinion. St. Liguori does not give his own opinion but quotes Sanchez and others: "Sanchez thinks that a person who follows a straight road is not bound to pay gate or bridge tolls levied for repairing the roads, because it would be very harsh to bind strangers to such payments." Sanchez and others regard this opinion as probable not only when a person conceals his merchandise but even when he hides himself. A tax of this sort need only be paid on demand.

Speaking of taxation in general, De Lugo is of opinion that a person should be made acquainted with his obligation to pay and cannot be afterwards compelled to make good any loss he may inflict on the public treasury, if he has even a probable opinion that any one of a large number of taxes which he has paid is unjust, or that he has already contributed sufficiently to the expenses of government.

According to all these authorities, Sapricius need not have any scruple of conscience.

TO SINCERE ROMAN CATHOLICS.

Kneel down: thou hast a lonely hour,
 And thou to seek thy God art free;
 The name of Jesus still has power;
 Ask, and the Lord shall answer thee.
 Job xiv., 15.

Canst thou not say, "If I am right,
 Lord, keep me in Rome's strictest way;
 If I am wrong, O give me light
 To show me where I go astray.
 Ps. xxv., 4, 5.

"If I am right, then bid me still,
 On bended knee, the Host adore;
 If I am wrong, incline my will
 To worship wafer gods no more.
 Isa. xlv., 9, 10.

"If I am right, bid me entreat
 Ten thousand saints my cause to aid;
 If I am wrong, at Jesus' feet
 Let all my prayers be only laid.
 I. Tim. ii., 5.

"If I am right, then bid me win,
 Through penal fires, a heavenly throne;
 If I am wrong, O cleanse my sin
 In Christ's redeeming blood alone.
 I. John i., 7.

"If I am right, still bid me brave,
 Safe in 'the Church,' hell's fiercest shock;
 If I am wrong, look down and save,
 And lead to Christ the only Rock.
 I. Cor. iii., 11.

"If I am right, my will control
 With faith to hear the priest forgive;
 If I am wrong, absolve my soul,
 And in the Living bid me live"?
 Isa. xliii., 25.

Wilt thou not pray in earnest thus,
 One deep, free prayer that light be given?
 With God, and not with man, discuss
 If thou art on the way to heaven.
 Amos v., 4-6.

There is one Book would point the way;
 Wilt thou not trust its heavenly light?
 Unclasp it now—kneel down and pray,
 And God direct thee to the right.
 Eph. i., 17, 18.

FATHER O'CONNOR'S LETTERS TO CARDINAL McCLOSKEY.

Second Series.

LETTER X.

NEW YORK, September 29th, 1885.

SIR:

The failure of the Jesuitical party in your Church to obtain control of the reformatory institutions of this State by means of the mis-called "Freedom of Worship" bill in the last Legislature has not deterred them from laying plans for the accomplishment of their purposes by the aid of politicians who may be elected by the "Roman Catholic Vote." [It used to be called the "Irish Vote," but as it has been discovered that there are many Irish Protestants and converted Catholic voters, the qualification "Roman Catholic Vote" is more appropriate.] While waiting for the assembling of the Legislature, your Jesuitical tools have not been idle. To capture the public schools by districts rather than by general legislation seems to be their new policy. Their latest effort has been in the West Troy (N. Y.) school district. The following documents will explain their mode of proceeding. The first is a circular address to the voters by Rev. James A. Curtin, the parish priest, in which he says:

"The object of the meeting to be held in the new school-house on Tuesday, July 28th, at 1 P.M., is to decide whether the district should be changed to an Union Free School District. We are anxious that this decision should be affirmative and, in this little pamphlet, we offer to you our reasons for wishing this change—reasons which, in our opinion, should induce all fair-minded men to vote with us.

"The schools of this State have three sources of revenue: 1. Interest derived from the United States deposit; 2. A share of the State taxes; 3. Taxes raised by local assessments. The interest on the United States deposit and the State tax are always about the same; the amount of the local tax depends on the vote of your tax meetings. A part of the money derived from the United States deposit and the State tax is used for the payment of Commissioners' and Superintendents' salaries, for the support of Indian Schools, etc. The remainder is divided into two unequal parts, 'one to be one-third and the other to be two-thirds of such remainder.' The one-third must be apportioned to the number of qualified teachers in each district 'and for every additional qualified teacher and his successors, who shall have actually taught in said school for the whole of said term, the district shall be entitled to another distributive quota.'

"If we should put our school under the control of the Trustees of this district, our teachers would become 'qualified teachers,' and this district would be entitled to twelve 'distributive quotas' instead of seven.

"From two sources we would gain—from the increase in the number of teachers and from the increase in the average daily attendance. The State now appropriates to this district about \$1,600. If our school could be

included in this apportionment the district would receive about \$2,400. This increase belongs to the district because you pay your share of the State taxes. That tax would be the same if you had one school or if you had ten schools. Including our school would not increase it, excluding our school would not diminish it, but as long as our school is excluded, this money will be lost to this district and distributed throughout the State.

"Now, as to the third source of school revenue—the local tax which the property owners pay, we promise not to increase it. All we ask is, that you help us to obtain this increase in the State appropriation, that the tax voters vote their average annual appropriation, and that the Trustees, if they can save anything from this money, give it to us as citizens who help to pay the tax. Let the Trustees make the schools on Middle Street [the public schools] their first care. Let those schools be well cared for under the system which now prevails. We do not wish to interfere with them. We know that we will not receive from these sources enough to pay the expenses of our school, but we will receive something; now we have to bear the whole burden unaided. We offer our school building to the district, free of rent. We offer to supply coal, wood, and all necessary school furniture. We offer to pay all contingent expenses. We can do this, but we find it difficult to pay the added burden of teachers' salaries. We ask you, since it will cost you nothing, to help us to lighten the burden.

"Now a few words to those who have, until now, felt it their duty to oppose us in this matter.

"1. You may ask what guarantee we give that these promises will be kept. We have given you our written promise—that is one proof of our sincerity. Besides, the voters of each school district are their own masters and at any time you can vote down an attempt to increase your taxes. Is not this power a sufficient guarantee against extra taxation? 2. You may ask why we do not send our children to the district schools already established. To this objection we give two answers:

"(1) The schools on Middle Street will not accommodate all the children of this district. Which would be cheaper, for you to accept our proposition and use our school building free of rent, or to increase your tax budget that accommodation may be provided for the children, who cannot find room in the schools now provided by the district? This is a business matter. Let the same wisdom which would guide you in your private business now guide you in this question. If a business man were asked to decide a similar question you could easily guess what his decision would be. You can give a practical business-like answer by your votes on Tuesday.

"(2) Our second answer to this question gives an entirely different reason. Even if the buildings were sufficiently large we would not send our children to them, because we believe in educating the soul as well as the mind; we believe in trying to make children good as well as learned. Learning without character is useless; character must be founded on a moral basis; there can be no morality without religion, and hence, we contend that there can be no true education without religion. In this reasoning you may not agree with us, but, as Americans and Christians, you must respect the conviction which forces Catholics, who pay about fifteen million dollars as State school tax, to freely give about ten millions annually for parish schools.

"2. But you will say that if we intend to teach religion in our school, we intend to violate a law of the State. To this we reply that we will not teach religion during school-hours. We promise to devote the same hours which district schools give, exclusively to instruction in the secular branches. If our teachers, after labors which other district school teachers find sufficiently

arduous, are willing to increase their own work by giving religious instruction, either before or after the ordinary school hours, surely neither the State nor any unbiased mind can reasonably object.

"If you answer that this is a mere evasion of the law, we answer by citing the decision of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the highest authority in the educational department of this State. He has decided that the system which we propose is perfectly legal. He now allows it in Poughkeepsie, and in many other places throughout the country. This system has been successfully practiced for a long time. The excellent results of the training received in Sisters' schools have been admitted by such men as Henry Kiddle, Superintendent of Schools in New York city; Hon. Matthew H. Ellis, of Yonkers, and the Board of Education of Poughkeepsie.

"In conclusion, we add a few words for which we ask careful consideration. Unfortunately, many people have misunderstood our motives in this matter. We do not wish to excite any religious animosities. We would be sorry if this meeting should be the occasion of any ill-will between neighbors. During the past two years we have received many little tokens of kind feelings from our friends in this village, and toward them we entertain none but kindly feelings. We have tried to be good neighbors and good friends, and to so conduct ourselves as to merit the respect of this community. We do not wish to interfere with the conscience of others, and we ask like consideration for ourselves. There is room for all of us to work for the elevation of mankind, We can all do some good. We may not agree as to the manner, but that is no reason why we should not work in harmony. In this school question we wish to injure no one, we are only trying to get a part of what we consider just. If you do not think that we have a right to a share of this fund, vote against us; but, if in your opinion, our request is just, we ask your assistance. In either case we will respect your honest decision, and know we will receive like courtesy from you.

"JAMES A. CURTIN."

To this the Trustees of the school district replied in the following circular:

"The undersigned, who have been intrusted with the management of School affairs in this district, address you this brief circular in order to correct any misapprehension relative to the proposition to change this district to an Union Free School District, into which you may have fallen by the perusal of a circular recently issued, signed by the Rev. James A. Curtin, and addressed to you.

"First.—He states his reasons for being anxious to have the change, *not* to raise the standard of education, or the grade of the schools in the district, but to obtain public money for the support of his parochial school, which he finds a difficult burden, and asks you to help to lighten.

"Second.—He says that the State funds appropriated to the district would be increased five-sevenths. He admits that he wants five teachers in his school, and correspondingly figures on the increase of State moneys when he says: 'The second of these parts (or one-third), is apportioned according to the average daily attendance of the pupils *residing in the district*,' and then adds 'the average daily attendance at St. Bridget's parish school was 215.' As the parish extends from the Congress Street bridge on the west to the 'bone factory' on the south, it includes many children who attend his school and do not reside in this school district, therefore the *total average* daily attendance at his school would not be a part of the basis of apportionment.

"Third.—The district school buildings are ample to accommodate all the school children residing in the district, and the force of teachers necessary to

instruct in the different grades is sufficient to teach all the children. The business-like way, then, would be to send all the children to the common school, and, by thus getting an increased State apportionment, lessen the 'local assessments.'

"Fourth.—The author of the circular referred to says: 'The voters of each school district are their own masters, and at any time you can vote down an attempt to increase your taxes.' This question is best answered by Section 17 of Title 9, of the school laws, entitled, 'Of Union Free Schools,' to wit:

"'If the inhabitants shall neglect or refuse to vote the sum or sums estimated necessary for teachers' wages, after applying thereto the public school moneys and other moneys received or to be received for that purpose, provided such estimate shall be for no more than one teacher for each fifty pupils attending such school, or if they shall neglect or refuse to vote the sum or sums estimated necessary for ordinary *contingent expenses*, the board of education may levy a tax for the same, in like manner as if the same had been voted by the inhabitants.'

"Further, should an Union Free School District be formed, no increase of State apportionment on account of teachers or attendance at the parochial school would be available until *April, 1887*.

"Finally, we have known neither Catholic nor Protestant in our management of the schools; our aim has been to serve all equally, and as best we could, and while we deplore the necessity of a contest, we feel that the best interest of the district at this juncture imperatively demands the continuance of the present school system therein, and the retention of the power in regard to taxation (both in reference to teachers' wages and contingent expenses), in the hands of the taxpayers and voters of the district.

"Make no mistake, therefore, but vote *against* the proposition to change the district to an Union Free School District.

"F. B. DURANT,

"R. WAUGH,

"E. VAN LEUVEN,

"Trustees."

The result of the election is told in the following letter, a reply to my inquiry, from a gentleman of the highest standing in the community:

WEST TROY, NEW YORK, August 24th, 1885.

REV. JAMES A. O'CONNOR:

DEAR SIR:—Your favor of the 21st inst. duly at hand. The Roman Catholics have made a most desperate effort in this school district to bring their parish schools within the *letter* of the law, and thereby obtain public money for their support. The school laws of this State are unfortunately most unguarded, loosely drawn, and in some respects almost positively contradictory, and it was under the Union Free School acts that the Catholics hoped to succeed. I enclose you a copy of the school notice, the priest's circular, and ours in answer. The account of the meeting, or more properly riot, is quite well given in the *Christian Advocate* of the 20th inst., and you can gather from papers enclosed and from that account all the facts. Our most reputable and peaceable citizens were assaulted at that meeting, in fact any one who offered objection to the scheme was told to "shut up," they "had nothing to say about it." Rroughs from out of the district, and strangers to most of us were brought

there, and their actions confirm the report that they were ready to do the greatest violence if necessary to carry the project through. Before that meeting I supposed I had many firm friends among the Catholics, and still believe that but for the direct and determined influence of the priests I should not have suffered any violence at their hands. The two priests were present at the meeting, and encouraged the violence used, apparently enjoying it as *good Roman Christians*.

To any fair-minded man it does not seem possible that the Superintendent of Public Instruction can do otherwise than annul the proceedings of the so-called meeting, as the facts are now clearly before him in appeal, substantiated by twenty affidavits. The answer from the Catholics has not been filed yet. I can give you their version when we receive it; we are prepared for some *tall swearing* in it, but we feel that "conquer we must, for our cause it is just." Should this event serve to arouse the American people to a realization of their danger, we who have had to bear the brunt of it, will be well repaid for the inconvenience and hard work experienced.

The unfairness of the demand of the Roman Catholics for public money is made more apparent by the fact that under the management of three Protestant trustees \$500 more have been paid last year to the Catholic teachers and janitor in the public school than to the Protestant teacher.

I will be glad to communicate anything new that may occur in relation to this matter, and am determined to "stand by my colors" at all hazards.

The following is the account in the *Christian Advocate*, to which my correspondent refers:

"An event has recently occurred in West Troy which shows, perhaps, a more than local purpose on the part of Romanists to secure public support for their parochial schools, and the unscrupulous and even riotous methods which may be adopted to secure such support. The event is so startling in its character as to deserve the widest mention in the public press, that every community in the State may be put on its guard against a like attempt.

"In that part of West Troy locally known as Fort Schuyler, the school district is provided with two good brick school-houses of sufficient capacity to accommodate all the children of school age in the district. The trustees are intelligent and conscientious men who have sought to employ teachers of the best qualifications regardless of religious creed, and, in fact have employed two or three Roman Catholic teachers. The burden upon the Catholic population in supporting the parochial schools had become so great that the priests of the parish conceived the idea of forming a *Union Free School District* which should include the *parochial* schools, and thus obtain support for these schools from the State. A meeting of the voters of the district was called to take action in the matter, and during the three weeks required by law for notice of such meeting the priests made a personal canvass of the district in the interests of their project.

"The meeting for action on the proposition to be submitted was taken possession of by an organized mob; the chairman of the Board of Trustees—a prominent citizen and an elder in the Presbyterian church—in protesting against illegal proceedings which had been commenced, was four times

assaulted, his clothing torn, and an attempt made to eject him from the room amid shouts of 'Put him out,' 'Kill him,' etc. Several who attempted to protect him were violently assaulted, and one Protestant was brutally stabbed in the neck. Indications point to the truthfulness of the statement, made by a prominent Roman Catholic the day after the meeting, that they 'were determined to carry the thing if they had to wade to their knees in blood.'

"Peaceably inclined citizens were compelled to withdraw from the meeting, the project was declared carried, and Catholic trustees were declared elected. The two priests in charge of the parish not only originated the scheme but furthered it, as before stated, by circular and personal canvass of the community. They were also present at the meeting, and made no attempt by word or act to quell the riotous proceedings, but seemed rather to approve and encourage the violence used. It is said that they went so far even as to compliment the mob on their orderly and good behavior! Is this the beginning of what we may expect to see in this country? Are other vulnerable points to be assailed? Having already been suffered to drive the Bible from our public schools, shall we allow these Romanists to get complete control of our public-school system and teach their religion to our children? Is there not need that we awake to the dangers which threaten us."

The length of this letter, Cardinal, compels me to defer further comment on this subject. I am not a politician, though I received a good training for that line of business in your Church, and cannot forget the tactics of ambitious priests to establish the supremacy of your Church in the United States.

Another election for State officers is approaching, and already the "interests of the Church" are discussed by "practical" politicians. Let the American people, however, remember that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," and observe the tendency of parties toward the policy of conciliating the Roman Catholic vote. The better element in your Church is opposed to having their religion mixed up with politics, but in the past as in the present your Church has been first and last a political power. God's kingdom will assuredly triumph over all earthly powers, and knowing this I call upon the people in your Church who desire to serve the Lord and be partakers of his blessings to come out from among you and be separate.

Yours truly,

JAMES A. O'CONNOR.

P. S. As this Letter goes to press I learn that Cardinal McCloskey is in a dying condition. The daily papers say that he "was respected by citizens of all creeds and classes for the mild benevolence of his character and his entire freedom from anything approaching sectarian bigotry in his relations with people of other religious persuasions." This I am willing to believe is true, but it is equally true that he was the head in this country of that Church which is so bigoted and intolerant towards "people of other religious persuasions" that it excommunicates them and, where it has the power, punishes them with death for their persuasion. Let us charitably hope that Cardinal McCloskey was better than his Church and that at the last he relied on the finished work of Christ for his salvation, and not on the ceremonial acts of his office. Now he knows, or he ought to know, that Jesus is "the only way, the truth and the life," and that "whosoever cometh to the Father by him, he will in no wise cast out."

J. A. O'C.

ROME: PAGAN AND PAPAL.

BY REV. MOURANT BROCK, M.A.

(Continued from Page 320.)

CHAPTER XVII.

POPE JOAN.

The story of the Dark Ages to which the title of this chapter refers, whether it be a true history or a fable, is so famous, and at the same time so characteristic of the period to which it is assigned, that it seems worth a few words.

A vivid reminiscence of my childhood, in the early years of this century, is a certain circular toy of Tunbridge ware which formed the centre of the round game of Pope Joan. After losing that association, I cannot remember to have heard the name of the Papessa for more than fifty years, and always regarded her as a fabulous personage. But at the end of that time, in 1878, happening to be in Siena, where the interior of the cathedral displays portraits of the Popes down to Alexander III., and having been told that the effigy of Pope Joan was once among them, I questioned the sacristan.

"Come here, sir," said he, politely, "and I will show you where she used to be."

So he took me with him to the great western door, and, after opening it to give light, pointed to a portrait on the north wall, near the west corner, and said, "There, sir, that was her place."

But if she were a fabulous person, how could she have found her way into that grand cathedral, and taken her place in the company of the Popes? By what means was the necessary sanction of the Bishop of the diocese, the Canons, and the other authorities of the Church, obtained? I carried my difficulty to two friends who were learned in such matters. The first told me that for five-and-twenty years he had felt convinced that her story was a fact; the other observed, "There is every reason to believe it."

These answers disposed me to study the subject, which I did, though I can by no means claim to have waded through the whole vast mass of literature connected with it.

The story is as follows: Joan was of English origin; she was beautiful, talented, and learned; but incontinent, an intriguer, and false.

While yet a girl she disguised herself as a male, and entered a monastery in order to join a monk for whom she had conceived a passion. Subsequently the lovers fled, and, after wandering hither and thither for some time, repaired to Athens with the view of perfecting themselves in Greek studies. There the monk died; and Joan, broken-hearted, but still disguised, went to Rome and opened a

school. It was not long before she had the satisfaction of seeing her lecture-room crowded with literary and distinguished men, and of knowing that the city was filled with the fame of her extraordinary learning and ability, and with her reputation for piety. She rose higher and higher in public estimation, until at last, upon the death of Leo IV. (A.D. 855), she was elected Pope, and "reigned prudently during two years, five months, and four days." At the end of that time, when passing in a public procession near the Colosseum—between it and the famous Church of St. Clemente—she was seized with the pains of labor, fell to the ground, and died.

So runs the tale. Baring-Gould, in his amusing *Myths of the Middle Ages*, thus disposes of it: "It need hardly be stated that the whole story of Pope Joan is fabulous, and rests on not the slightest historical foundation. . . . A paper war was waged upon the subject, and finally the whole story was proved conclusively to be utterly destitute of historical truth."

Such strong language from a clerical author, to whom the present Premier, Mr. Gladstone, has granted a literary pension, ought to carry weight. But, though I would not contradict it absolutely, I am, at the same time, prepared to maintain that no one who has carefully and impartially sifted the evidence could be justified in making so unqualified an assertion as that which has just been quoted.

But our author makes another, which may be positively denied. It is, that "the great champions of the myth were the Protestants of the sixteenth century;" of whom we are then told that "they were thoroughly unscrupulous in distorting history and in suppressing facts."

The "myth" was, however, as we shall presently show, established and recognized by Roman Catholics centuries before the Reformation. And Mr. Baring-Gould's characterization of the Protestants is a shameful calumny, at which, however, we cannot profess surprise when we read his laudation of their persecutors, and find him describing the Papal system as "a Church where every sanctuary is adorned with all that can draw the heart to the Crucified, and raise the thoughts to the imposing ritual of heaven."

Why has not this writer, and why have not many others of the same class, honestly joined themselves to the Church which they delight to honor? Why have they remained in a communion which owes its constitution and its articles of faith to that Reformation which they are ever eager to vilify, and which Mr. Baring-Gould is said to have described as "a miserable apostacy"?

"The whole story was proved conclusively to be utterly destitute of historical truth."

Let us see how this statement bears the test of investigation. But before we adduce direct evidence, it would be well to inquire whether Rome was at the time so holy and so pure that such an episode would have been impossible, or, at least, in a high degree improbable.

The date assigned to Pope Joan is A.D. 855, and Marriott, in writing of that and the two following centuries, calls them "a period of darkness, both intellectual and moral (especially so at Rome itself), such as the Christian world

has never known either before or since." (*Vestiarius Christianum*, LXXXIII.) In support of this statement he quotes the testimony of the great Roman annalist, Cardinal Baronius, who, in commenting upon A.D. 912, writes as follows:

"What at that time was the condition of the Holy Roman Church! How superlatively foul, when harlots, most powerful as they were most disgraceful, were ruling at Rome, at whose will sees were changed and bishops appointed, while—horrible and shocking to tell!—false Pontiffs, their lovers, were from time to time thrust into the chair of Peter! Such men are entered in the lists of Popes only to record the lapse of time; for who could affirm that those were legitimate Roman Pontiffs who were lawlessly thrust into their office by whores?"

These are strong words, but they were not written by Protestants of the sixteenth century. Is it impossible that among the false Pontiffs Joan might have been thrust into the chair of Peter by some of her lovers, Cardinals who were quite aware of her sex?

"For a contemporary picture," says Marriott, "of what Rome then was—a picture which more than justifies such language as the above—see the Sixth Book of the *Historia Luitprandi Episcopi*." He also adds that "Genebrardus, Archbishop of Aix (*Chronographia*, lib. iv., p. 553), speaks of this period of awful corruption, in the Papal See itself, as lasting for one hundred and fifty years, and through a succession of fifty Pontiffs."

With such testimony before us, we may surely dismiss the question of impossibility, and boldly affirm that no antecedent improbability can be alleged against the story of Joan.

For direct evidence to its credibility we shall rely upon these three facts:

- I. A medallion of Joan, set in its proper order among the portraits of the Popes, existed for some two and a half centuries in the Cathedral of Siena.
- II. A statue was erected to her at Rome, on the spot where she is said to have died, and it remained in its place until the times of the Reformation.
- III. Her reign is recorded, and her portrait given, with those of the other Popes, in the *Nuremberg Chronicle* (A.D. 1493).

(1) In regard to the medallion at Siena, I have already mentioned my own experience. Murray's *Guide* contains the following notice: "Pope Zacharias was originally the bust of Pope Joan. It had the inscription, 'Johannes VIII., *Femina de Anglia*' (that is, 'John VIII., an English woman'). In 1600, it was metamorphosed by the Grand Duke, at the suggestion of Clement VIII. and Cardinal Tarugi."

There can be little doubt as to the truth of this statement, in proof of which we will adduce the testimony of the Jesuit Bower (b. 1686, d. 1766), who was Public Professor of Rhetoric, History, and Philosophy, in the Universities of Rome, Fermo, and Macerata, and also Counsellor of the Inquisition in the latter place. From his *Lives of the Popes*, London, 1759, we gather the following information respecting the medallion:

That it was in its place at Siena in the time of Baronius (b. 1538, d. 1607).

That it was fixed between Leo IV. and Benedict III., and bore the inscription, "John VIII., an English woman."

That, at the request of the Cardinal Archbishop of the city, Tarugi, the features were altered in 1600.

And that some time previous to 1677, since every one knew that it had once represented the female Pope, it was broken or removed, in order that her very memory might be abolished.

The destruction of the figure took place in the Pontificate of Alexander VII. (1655-67), who, being himself a Siennese, was, perhaps, jealous for the reputation of his native town, and, therefore, finally removed the scandal from it.

After its disappearance in 1677, the learned Franciscan and Provincial of his order, Antonius Pagi, passed through Siena, and some curious particulars of his visit are given by Bower :

"How great care was taken at Siena to abolish all remembrance of Pope Joan, as well as of the statue with which she was honored in the stately cathedral of that city, will appear from what happened to the very learned Father, Antonius Pagi, as related by himself.

"Since Pagi, when passing through Siena in 1677, was very desirous of being informed upon the spot of every particular relating to the famous statue of the she-Pope in that cathedral, he applied for information to the religious of his own order. But, to his great surprise, they all pretended never to have heard of such a statue. Thereupon Pagi, finding that they declined—he knew not why—to enter upon the subject, repaired to the cathedral, and, addressing most of the prebendaries as they came out of the choir, told them that he wished to see the statue of Pope Joan, and begged that they would show it to him, since it might afford him some new light to confute the fable, and confound the heretics. But they all walked off, without so much as deigning to give him an answer.

"When they had gone, a man advanced in years accosted him, introduced himself as one who had long been attached to the cathedral, and said that since his inquiries were not prompted by idle curiosity, but by a desire for the good of the Church, he would furnish him with such information as might be thought necessary for so worthy a purpose, on condition that he undertook never to disclose the source from whence he obtained it. With this condition Pagi readily complied; and thereupon the old man answered all his questions, showed him the place where the statue had stood, and told him how it had first been changed into that of Zachary, and at what time it had been altogether removed, namely, in the Pontificate of Alexander VII., a native of Siena.

"Here I cannot help observing," continues Bower, "that the promise of secrecy insisted on by the old man, the clownish behavior of the dignitaries of the Church in one of the most polite cities of Italy, and the shyness of the friars, averse to enter upon the topic of the female Pope even with a very learned man of their own order, who, they knew, would make a good use of their information, plainly show that an order had been issued by the Inquisition commanding all the inhabitants of Siena to observe a strict silence with respect to Pope Joan and her statue."

In 1699, Montfaucon, the learned French Benedictine monk, after an antiquarian tour in Italy, in the course of which he was received by the Pope with great distinction, returned home through Siena, and subsequently wrote as follows in his *Antiquities of Italy*:

"On a cornice in a row (in the cathedral) are the images of a hundred and seventy Popes, from the shoulders upwards, all in clay. The first is St. Peter (the first now is Christ), the last, Adrian IV. Order is not observed; for some are double, the anti-Popes being inserted, and the true omitted.

"Pope Joan was formerly there; but, at the request of Clement VIII., the then Duke of Tuscany changed the name of Joan into Zachary.

"These heads of Popes were made and placed there A.D. 1400."

The reader will observe that this learned antiquary and very decided Papist does not speak, as is now the custom, of the story or fable of Joan, but mentions her as he would any other Pope—"Pope Joan was formerly there." This is not, of course, conclusive as to his opinion, and I have not studied his numerous folios sufficiently to know whether he has elsewhere expressed himself upon the subject. But his mode of speaking in the passage just quoted favors the idea that he believed in the existence of the female Pope, as he certainly did in that of her statue.

So much, then, for the medallion, which was unquestionably permitted to remain in the cathedral at Siena for some two centuries in its original condition as Pope Joan, and in its altered form as Pope Zachary for half a century longer. The fact that it was placed in such a position in A.D. 1400 certainly indicates a general belief, on the part of the ecclesiastics of the time, in the historical reality of the person represented, and an utter indifference to the scandal of her story. We now pass on to our second point, the statue in the street of Rome.

(2) In the King's Library at Paris there is a manuscript of John Burcardt, Bishop of Horta, who was "Master of Ceremonies of the Pope's Chapel" during the reign of five Pontiffs, from 1483 to 1506. Entirely and deservedly trusted by his employers, of whom he was a close observer, and with whose private life he had abundant opportunity of becoming acquainted, he was accustomed to amuse himself by writing a daily journal of the proceedings of the Papal court. Soon after the year 1785 an account of his manuscript, with extracts, was prepared by a committee of French Academicians, and published by order of the King. In 1789 it was translated and published in England (London, R. Faulder), and from that edition I take the subjoined passage, dated December 27th, 1487:

"The Pope, returning in state on horseback, passed through the street in which the figure of Pope Joan is placed in memory of her lying-in. Now it is pretended that the Popes, in their cavalcades, ought never to pass through that street. The Pope was, therefore, blamed by the Archbishop of Florence and some other prelates for having gone that way."

But this feeling was not universal among the dignitaries; for Burcardt relates that he talked about the matter to one bishop, who said "that it was nonsense, and that the very mention of it savored of heresy."

M. Brequigny, the Academician who translates and comments on the extracts from Burcardt, remarks on the passage just quoted: "The year [1487] produces a fact which appears to me worthy to be selected," that is, from the general matter of the Journal. And presently he gives his reason for the preference: "It seems by this that at Rome there was at the time a general belief in the story of Pope Joan."

So late, then, as the end of A.D. 1487, the statue of the Papessa was to be seen in a street of Rome. And it appears to have remained there for many subsequent years; for when, about A.D. 1511, Luther visited the Imperial City, this scandalous exhibition was one of the many things which horrified him.

"Another day, passing down a wide street leading to St. Peter's, he halted in astonishment before a stone statue, representing a pope, under the figure of a woman, holding a sceptre, clothed in the papal mantle, and carrying a child in her arms. It was a young woman of Mentz, he was told, whom the Cardinals elected Pope, and who was delivered of a child opposite this place. No Pope, therefore, passes along that street. 'I am surprised,' says Luther, 'that the Popes allow such a statue to remain'" (D'Aubigné's *History of the Reformation*, vol. i., p. 195).

Even Bower—whom we have already quoted, and who, like other post-Reformation Papists, endeavors to cast contempt on the story of Joan—makes this admission: "We cannot doubt that a statue was to be seen in the place where Joan is supposed to have been delivered of a son."

He also mentions Theodore of Neim, who was secretary to two Popes, and who tells us that the statue was standing when he wrote, in A.D. 1413. "In his time," says Bower, "the fable of the female Pope obtained universally. Not that we can hence believe the story to be true, but only that it was believed when the statue was erected, as it was believed when the medallion was placed in the cathedral of Siena" (Vol. iv., p. 257).

So general a credence may well have produced the old monkish line—

"Papa Pater Patrum : peperit Papessa Papellum."

"Popes father Fathers : but the Papess Joan
Mothers a Pope—brings forth a little one."

(3) We have now to notice the evidence of the *Nuremberg Chronicle*, a curious history of the world, brought down to A.D. 1493, the date of its publication. It is written in much abbreviated Latin, printed in black letter, and adorned with woodcuts. Besides numerous pictures of kings, legislators, poets, philosophers, and other celebrated persons, sacred and profane, it also contains portraits of the Popes and Emperors, the former beginning with Linus and ending with Alexander VI., who assumed the tiara about a year before its publication. A great curiosity it is, but very troublesome to read on account of its many abbreviations.

In this *Chronicle* Joan is found in her proper place among the Popes; her portrait is reproduced on the opposite page. In it she wears a triple crown, just the same as that of her brother Pontiffs; but she does not carry a staff with a double cross, as they do, since her hands are occupied with her child. No

objection is made to her, nor is there any particular notice. About ten lines are devoted to her history, and she is described in the index to the volume as "Johannes Papa Septimus Anglicus mulier fuit in habitu virili." That is, "Pope John VII., of English extraction, was a woman in male disguise."

The *Chronicle* states that her Pontificate lasted two years, five months, and four days. And it further records that, after her death, two things were observed with regard to the Popes. The first, that they never proceeded to the Lateran by the way of the street in which she died; the second, that from that date means were taken, at his election, to substantiate the sex of a new Pope.

The last clause alludes to the *sedes stercoraria* on which formerly the Popes were made to sit at their installation. From Burcardt's Journal we learn that this custom was practised as late at least as the coronation of Julius II., A.D. 1503.

Bower admits it as strong historic evidence of the general early belief in a Papess. It would seem that it must have originated in something of the kind, although a silly attempt has been made to explain it from Psalm cxiii., 7, a verse which was probably used to hide its real significance.

As to the conjectures mentioned by Bower to explain away the episode of Joan, they are as disgraceful to the Holy See as the story itself. "Aventinus," says he, "will have it that the fable originated in Pope John I., who was raised to the See by Theodora, an imperious courtesan. And Pauvinius is of opinion that Joan Rainiere, another famous courtesan, who with uncontrolled power governed both John XII. and the State, was in raillery called the she-Pope."

A comparatively recent Roman Catholic historian of the Popes, the Spaniard Lorenté, who wrote in 1822, is, I observe, quoted as accepting Joan, and placing her in the Papal succession of the year 855.

It will be noticed that we have supported all our arguments by Roman Catholic authorities. The Protestants of the sixteenth century did undoubtedly press their opponents with this as well as with other scandals of the Papacy but they were by no means "the great champions of the myth"; and a more decided refutation of Mr. Baring-Gould's baseless charge could not be found than the words of the Jesuit Bower, who thus expresses himself in regard to Joan:

"She owes her existence and promotion to the Roman Catholics themselves. By them the fable was invented; it was published by their priests and monks before the Reformation, and was credited upon their authority even by those who were most attached to the Holy See, St. Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, being among them. *Nor did they begin to confute it till the Protestants reproached them with it.* Æneas Silvius (Pius II., died A.D. 1464) was the first to question the fact by saying that 'the story was not certain' " (p. 259). It will be noticed that the character of this negation is sufficiently qualified.

Thus even Bower, anxious as he was to get rid of the story, establishes several points in favor of its authenticity, and finds himself compelled to admit its possibility. And he speaks in just the same strain as other authors respecting the morals of the time, affirming that Rome "was profaned by the bullies,

lovers, and bastards, of public prostitutes, who governed the city with absolute sway, and raised their favorites to the See of St. Peter " (p. 251).

The main points, then, which we have been enabled to extract from the testimony we have adduced are as follows :

That Protestants neither invented nor popularized the story of Joan.

That if it were an invention, "it was invented and published by priests and monks before the Reformation, and credited upon their authority even by those most attached to the Holy See."

That the immorality of the Papal court at that time, and subsequently, made any iniquity possible at Rome.

That for some centuries the episode of a Papess seems to have been generally accepted as a historical fact in the Roman Catholic world.

That the Papists did not begin to confute the story until the Protestants reproached them with it.

That the name and portrait of Joan appear with those of other Popes in the *Nuremberg Chronicle*, a Roman Catholic work published before the Reformation, in A.D. 1493.

That a statue in commemoration of herself and her sad end was erected by her co-religionists on the spot where she died, and remained there for centuries.

That her medallion, duly inscribed with the words "Joannes VIII., *Femina de Anglia*," was placed in the Cathedral of Siena, and up to the year A.D. 1600 was to be seen there among the effigies of preceding and subsequent Popes.

In regard to the last two points I would ask, When in the capital of a country, and with the sanction of the authorities of that capital, a statue is known to have been erected in a public place, in commemoration of an event said to have happened on that spot to the ruler of the country; and when, in one of the most notable and splendid buildings of that country, the bust of the same ruler has also been seen, associated, in a complete collection, with portraits of the other rulers of the land—with such evidence before us, are we justified in affirming that both the event and the ruler so commemorated are fables "utterly destitute of historic truth"?

I think not; and must confess my own conviction that Joan is a historical person, and her story in the main a fact. This was the general belief for centuries, during those times of corruption when immorality was a very venial sin, and such a history brought no blush to the cheek. But the Reformation dawned, and the Word of God began to teach men to discern between light and darkness, between right and wrong: the Spirit convinced even the world of sin. A certain sense of shame and concealment, which in the case of the wicked is ever the companion of shame, ensued, and men strove to deny a fact of which they were no longer disposed to speak either with bravado or indifference. Hence the change in Roman Catholic writers in regard to this subject: they were no longer acquiescent or apathetic, but were stimulated by an intense anxiety to discredit so shameful a story—an anxiety sometimes leading to extravagance like that of the Bollandist Du Sollier, who talks of "fabella sexcenties jam exsufflata, convulsa, et obtrita." At the same time the whole tone of society was raised by the dissemination of the Holy Scriptures, a more healthful public opinion began to spread through Europe, and those who wished to obliterate the memory of Joan were helped by the fact that men now found it difficult to conceive of such a state of things as would render the intrusion of a female Pope possible. And so the story was speedily conveyed from the realm of fact into the dreamland of fable.